

Roberts et al. in view of Horii et al. Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Horii as applied to Claim 6 and further in view of Collins. Claims 10-14 were otherwise indicated to include allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form.

New Claims 18-30 are added by the present response to present subject matter indicated as allowable in the Office Action. Specifically, new independent Claim 18 corresponds to previously pending allowable Claim 10 rewritten in independent form. New Claims 19-30 parallel Claims 2-14 but depend on new independent Claim 18. New Claims 18-30 are believed to be allowable, in light of their inclusion of allowable subject matter.

Now turning to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Collins, that rejection is traversed by the present response. Claim 1 has been amended to recite “the flat conductor resists electrical arcing without exceeding 300°C”.² In view of the above, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest every feature now recited in the claims as Collins does not teach a flat conductor that resists electrical arcing “without exceeding 300°C”. One problem to be solved by the invention of Claim 1 is the resistance to flashovers or electrical arcing that are applied to the type of claimed resistance. The present inventors have recognized that the resistance to flashovers includes particularly ensuring that the temperature of a metallic conductor does not get hot enough to deteriorate an organic substrate. The present inventors have recognized in this respect that it is preferable that the temperature of the conductor during a flashover does not exceed a given temperature on the order of 300°C. Such a feature clarified in Claim 1 is not addressed in the applied art to Collins, and thus Claims 1-14 and 18-30 are now believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections

² Support for this change is found in the specification at page 4, lines 24-26.

based on the added feature of “the flat conductor resists electrical arcing without exceeding 300 °C”³.

Now turning to the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Roberts et al, this rejection is rendered moot by the above amendment and argument as Roberts et al fails to address the features now recited in independent Claim 1, and the claims dependent there from.

Now turning to all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to Claims 4-9, these rejections are rendered moot in light of the above amendment and argument. Amended Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-14 are also submitted to be patentable over the prior art in view of their respective dependencies to Claim 1.

The present amendment is submitted in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which after final rejection, permits entry of amendments placing the claims in better form for consideration on appeal. As the present amendment is believed to overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) the present amendment places the application in better form for consideration on appeal. In addition, the present amendment is not believed to raise new issues since the changes to Claim 1 are of a minor nature. It is therefore respectfully requested that 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be liberally construed and that the present amendment be entered.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-14 and 18-30 is earnestly solicited.

³See MPEP § 2143.03: “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.

Should the Examiner deem any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, he or she is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

RECEIVED
JUN 27 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703) 413-2220
TJM\cja

I:\atty\Tjm\202720US\202720us-af.wpd